

REMARKS

Claims 1-99 and 103 were pending. Claims 11-40 and 56-75 were cancelled. Claims 1, 42, 43, 53-55, 76, 77, 82, 84, 95, and 103 were amended. Claims 104-134 were added. Therefore, claims 1-10, 41-55, 76-99, and 103-134 are currently pending.

No new matter was added. Claims 1, 42, 43, 53-55, 76, 77, 82, 84, 95, and 103 were amended to clarify the invention. Support for new claims 104-134 can be found, for example, in the specification as originally filed, at least in claims 53-55 and 76.

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 41, 44-52, and 103 were allowed.

Rejection of Claims 1, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 42, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as “being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which [A]pplicant[s] regard as the invention.” According to the Examiner, claim 1 “incorrectly recites “one of R⁹” and claims 42 and 43 misspell “thiazolyl.”

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection no longer pertains to the claims as currently pending and respectfully request that this rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Objection to Claims 1-10, 53-55, and 76-99

The Examiner objected to claims 1-10, 53-55, and 76-99 because “they are directed to an improper misjoinder of inventions.”

Applicants respectfully submit that this objection no longer pertains to the claims as currently pending and respectfully request that this objection to the claims be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Cancellation of and/or amendments to the claims should in no way be construed as an acquiescence to any of the Examiner's objections and/or rejections. The cancellation of the and amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the above-identified application. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or another patent application. The amendments made to the claims are not related to any issues of patentability.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's Attorney would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is urged to call Elizabeth A. Hanley, Esq. at (617) 227-7400.

Date: August 26, 2003

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
Attorneys at Law

By



Cynthia M. Soroos
Reg. No. 53,623
28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214